REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 19-37 are pending in the application. All pending claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 19-20, 23, 25-26, 29-30, 32, and 37 are amended. Claim 36 is cancelled. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentably distinct from the cited prior art and in condition for immediate allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 19-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Office notes that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class or (2) transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing. The Office asserts that the Applicant's method steps "fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit" test, stating that "they may be performed within the human mind." No assertion is made with respect to the second prong.

Applicant has amended independent claims 19, 25, and 32, and dependent claims 20, 23, 26, 29, 30, and 37, to clarify that the method steps are computer-implemented and that some of the steps operate on information in a database stored on a computer readable storage medium. Furthermore, certain steps recite generating views, Views are defined in the specification as "information furnished for an object," and according to the specification information is furnished "by audio or video or both means." Accordingly, these steps cannot be performed within the human mind. The first prong of

the test is satisfied and Applicant submits that the claims present patentable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,978,273, issued to Bonneau et al. ("Bonneau"). Applicant respectfully submits that Bonneau does not disclose all the elements of the claims as required to anticipate the claimed invention under § 102. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim.) Specifically, Bonneau does not disclose, as recited by claim 19, "applying a first rule . . . to generate a first view of the specific tangible object , the first view *including only **attributes** in compliance with the first rule*" and "applying a second rule . . . to generate a second view of the specific tangible object , the second view *including only* **attributes** *in compliance with the second rule*."

Distributing information about inventory to a variety of audiences can be challenging when each audience has different needs for information. Furthermore, the distributor of the information may want certain audiences to see only certain information, while wanting another audience to see different information. For example, a manufacturer may want retail customers to view the retail price for products but not the wholesale price. When a retailer requests information about a product, the manufacturer wants to return only the retail price and not the wholesale price. When a wholesaler requests information about a product, the manufacturer may choose to return only the wholesale price, or may also return the retail price. The manufacturer

11

wants this capability without the burden of maintaining two separate databases of information (one with the retail price and one without).

The claimed embodiments address these challenges by applying rules associated with the requesting audience. The rules determine what attributes of a product are returned to the requesting audience. A single database of inventory can be maintained, and information from the database associated with an object is customized according to the audience when presented.

Independent claims 19, 25, and 32 recite a "first view including only attributes in compliance with the first rule" and a "second view including only attributes in compliance with the second rule." Applicant respectfully submits that Bonneau does not teach these claim elements.

Bonneau discloses a system for presenting custom catalogs. Bonneau, Abstract. The Office points to the language of Bonneau stating that "a set of rules . . . defines the scope of the content of the custom catalog." However, the customization taught in Bonneau is limited to the product level. The listing of products that a particular requesting audience views will be customized according to the rules. No mention is given to customizing the presentation of the information about or attributes of products. Rather, the disclosure makes clear that the requester will receive all the information available that is associated with each product. More specifically, the requester will receive a "custom version of the seller's catalog consist[ing] of a subset of the items in the catalog databse." Bonneau, col. 4, lines 36-37. A SKU number is returned, and each SKU number that is returned "identifies a unique item consisting of a unique set of attribute values." Bonneau, col. 4, lines 51-53. "This physical manifestation of the

12

buyer's custom version of the catalog data (consisting of *all descriptive and attribute information* for each SKU in the set) is then physically exported in its entirety to the buyer's site for incorporation. Bonneau, col. 5, lines 29-33. All information associated with each product is always included when the rule determines a product should be presented. Bonneau, Fig. 5C, designation 584.

Furthermore, the general form computer code provided in column 9 makes clear that what is being returned by the rule is simply the representation of the product – the full representation including all attributes – having the requested attributes. Bonneau, col. 9, lines 35-40, 51-57. No discussion is given to presenting only certain attributes of a product based on applying a rule.

Because Bonneau does not disclose "applying a first rule . . . to generate a first view of the specific tangible object , the first view including only attributes in compliance with the first rule" and "applying a second rule . . . to generate a second view of the specific tangible object, the second view including only attributes in compliance with the second rule," Bonneau does not anticipate claims 19, 25, and 32.

As the independent claims represent patentable subject matter, Bonneau also does not anticipate dependent claims 20-24, 26-31, 33-35, and 37.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that Bonneau does not disclose all the elements of the claimed invention and does not anticipate the claimed invention. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at 801-578-

6994 in the event that any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of this Application is found.

DATED this 7th day of October, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

By /**John R. Thompson**/
John R. Thompson
Registration No. 40,842

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999

14